

#14

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/787,402	KAWAKAMI, MASAHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mike Rahmjoo	2676	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mike Rahmjoo.

(3) Matthew C. Bella

(2) Yong Chui

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: March 4, 2004

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all of record

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant's representation suggested amending the claims with "parts are being physically separated". The examiner pointed out that these amendments appear to overcome the art of record. A new search will also be needed.

Matthew C. Bella

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600
Examiner's signature, if required